

Prolegomena to the new edition of Francesco da Buti's commentary on Dante's Commedia. Purgatorio

Article

Accepted Version

Tardelli, C. (2019) Prolegomena to the new edition of
Francesco da Buti's commentary on Dante's Commedia.
Purgatorio. Variants: The Journal of the European Society for
Textual Scholarship (14). pp. 95-116. ISSN 1573-3084
(Unpublished) Available at
<https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/79241/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the
work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Published version at: <https://journals.openedition.org/variants/964>

Publisher: Rodopi

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law,
including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other
copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in
the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

CLAUDIA TARDELLI TERRY

(University of Cambridge)

*Prolegomena to the new edition of Francesco da Buti's Commentary on
Dante's Commedia. Purgatorio*¹

“Gegen die Kontamination
ist kein Kraut gewachsen”
(Maas 1957³, 34)

MANUSCRIPTS²

Commedia

- N** NAPLES, Biblioteca Nazionale “Vittorio Emanuele III”, XIII C 1; parch.; XV (first two decades); cc. IV + 313 + III’; mm. 365 x 260
- B** FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Conventi Soppressi 204 (*olim* Badia Fiorentina L– IX); parch.; XIV ex./XV in. (1405 f. 265ra); cc. IV + 281 + III’; mm. 398 x 277
- M** FLORENCE, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Banco Rari 39 (*olim* Fondo nazionale II I 29; Magl. VII 1232); parch.; XV in.; cc. IV + 464 + II’; mm. 355 x 260

Purgatorio

- C** CITTÀ DEL VATICANO, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chigi L V 168, chart., XIV ex., cc. 334, mm. 220 x 150

¹ This study, which is in part based upon my doctoral dissertation (Tardelli Terry 2015), follows and complements those on the *Inferno* (Tardelli 2010–11; Tardelli 2014), and precedes that on the *Paradiso*, which will shortly be published. I am grateful to Zyg Barański for his enthusiastic response to the new edition project at all stages, and for his intellectual generosity. I am also indebted to Fabrizio Franceschini, Simon Gilson, Helena Sanson, and Fabrizio Cigni for their invaluable and helpful comments.

² The *regesto* of Buti’s MSS was firstly published in Franceschini 1995, 103–04. An up-to-date description of the *Inferno* MSS (+ B, N, and M) can be found in Tardelli 2014, 83–91.

- L** FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Pluteo 42.18, chart.; XV in.; cc. I + 337 + I'; mm. 280 x 210
- L2** FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Pluteo 42.15; chart., and parch.; 1431; cc. III + 172 + II'; mm. 295 x 215
- MB'** MILAN, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, AF XI 32; chart.; XV in.; cc. 192; mm. 395 x 285
- R2** FLORENCE, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 1007; parch.; 1413; cc. III + 208 + I'; mm. 375 x 270
- R4** FLORENCE, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 1015; chart.; XV (second half); cc. I + 170; mm. 405 x 265

*

Soon after Dante's death in 1321, the popularity of the *Commedia* was already so extraordinary in its kind as to generate the need of an exegesis on the poem similar to that which had previously been reserved almost exclusively for Classical authors.³ The relevance of Dante early exegesis to both Dantists and, more generally, scholars of the medieval commentary tradition is undoubted. Nevertheless, whilst these commentaries contain relevant data they must be subjected to careful interpretation because the textual tradition of each commentary has not always been studied in the depth it deserves and there are problems with the editions, most nineteenth-century, that scholars have to rely on. Over the last two decades, however, a mesmerizing effort has been put in place in order to overcome such an issue so that Dante commentaries can be finally read on modern and accurate editions.

The main objective of a new edition of a fourteenth-century commentary on Dante's *Commedia*, as with all the other Dante commentaries recently published, including those that belong to the "Edizione Nazionale dei commenti danteschi",⁴ is to provide a reliable and accurate text,

³ On the Dante early commentary tradition, see: Dionisotti 1965; Mazzoni 1965; Sandkühler 1967; Jenaro-MacLennan 1974; Vallone 1981; Minnis and Scott, eds. 1988, pp. 440–58; Hollander 1994; Parker 1997; Barański 2001; Bellomo 2004; Gilson 2005; Franceschini 2008; Malato and Mazzucchi, eds. 2011; Nasti and Rossignoli, eds. 2013.

⁴ The number of editions that has appeared in the last twenty or so years is impressive. See at least, Bellomo, ed. 1989; Rossi, ed. 1990; Rossi, ed. 1998; Pisoni and Bellomo, eds. 1998; Chiamenti, ed. 2002. See also the edition of the *Ottimo* ed. by Di Fonzo 2008, whose flaws have been highlighted by Perna 2009. A useful work of reference on the Trecento Dante commentators is Bellomo 2004. Within the 'Edizione Nazionale' project, see Procaccioli, ed. 2001; Mazzucchi, ed. 2002; Marzo, ed. 2003; Mazzucchi, ed. 2004; Abardo, ed. 2005; Marucci, ed. 2004; Pirovano, ed. 2006; Corrado, ed. 2007; Volpi, ed. 2009; Azzetta, ed. 2012; Rinaldi, ed. 2013. For information regarding the project, see Malato et al., eds. 2008, 32–46. For a complete presentation of the entire manuscript tradition of Dante's commentators, see Malato and Mazzucchi, eds. 2011.

expurgated of errors, equipped with an apparatus which critically justifies the editor's textual choices, and furnished with an *apparatus fontium*.

The main aim of this preparatory study to the new critical edition of Francesco da Buti's *commento* (1385–96) is to investigate the manuscript tradition of the *Purgatorio*. These *Prolegomena* thus mainly provide an introduction to a better understanding of the relationships between the extant manuscript tradition, and attempt to offer broader methodological reflections on how a long prose text can be critically edited, despite the fact that the *constitutio textus* cannot be arrived at in a mechanical way, due to the presence of numerous contaminations and interpolations. The study therefore highlights why it seems appropriate to base the edition on a single authoritative manuscript (namely MS N). A general introduction on the figure of Francesco da Buti and on the circumstances of composition is also given, together with some of the more relevant information regarding the most authoritative manuscripts containing the *commento* in its entirety (MSS B, M, and N). The *Prolegomena* offered here follow those to the *Inferno* (Tardelli 2014) and precede the investigation on the *Paradiso*, which will be shortly published.

Francesco da Buti (1324?–1406), Pisan by birth and a notary from 1352, started his career as a *Magister* at the Pisan *Studio* in 1351, where, twenty years later, he was appointed to the Chair of Latin by Pietro Gambacorta, the Governor of Pisa,⁵ and for almost the rest of his life he taught classical Latin literature at the university. His scholarly production in Latin includes an *Accessus* to Terence's Comedies and commentaries on Horace's *Ars Poetica*, on Persius' *Saturae*, as well as on Alexander of Villedieu's *Doctrinale*. Furthermore, between 1355 and 1378, he composed and published the *Regule grammaticales*, also called the *Regule pisane* or *Notabilia pisana*, “the most influential secondary school-level treatise of the fourteenth century” (Black 2013, 262). From 1349 onwards, Francesco took on numerous institutional and civic offices in the Pisan government. In 1365 he became Notary of the Seniors, and in 1369 Chancellor of the Seniors, namely the secretary and chancellor of the city government. As well as being appointed to the Chair of Latin as “Doctor Gramatice” [*sic*], he was nominated to several other important offices, for instance, a second mandate as Chancellor of the Seniors and Official Ambassador to Florence (1397) and to Venice

⁵ In September 1370, Pietro Gambacorta was proclaimed “chapitano di guerra et difenzore del popolo”, namely overlord of Pisa. One of the first initiatives that he took was to relaunch the University, also called the *Studio Pisano*. In December 1370, a committee of *Sapientes Viri* recommended the appointment of the jurists Pietro del Lante and Piero degli Albizi, the medical doctor Andrea Gittalebraccia and Francesco da Buti “actendentes quantum nunc Franciscus doctor gramatice infrascriptus pisane civitati sit necessarius et pariter ad edocendum gramatice scientiam fructuosum” (Archivio di Stato Pisano = ASP, *Comune*, divisione A, reg. 38, f. 290). See Franceschini, 2011a, 194. For more general information on Pietro Gambacorta, see Silva 1911, and Tangheroni 2002.

(1398). During 1385 Buti was commissioned to give public lectures in the Pisan *Studium* on Dante's *Commedia*.⁶ In 1392 the commentator had reached at least as far as *Paradiso* 6. In fact, in the rather long *commento* on ll. 1–9 of the canto, the year 1392 (N, f. 158va) is mentioned in the discussion of Wenceslaus IV, King of Bohemia, elected but still not crowned as Holy Roman Emperor (Varanini 1995, 35; Franceschini 1998a, 219–20):

lo CXIII (*scil.* imperatore) è hora Vinceslao re di Boemia, filliuolo del dicto Karlo, lo quale non è anco coronato benché corra de la incarnatione l'anno MCCCCLXXXIII. (*stile pisano*, therefore 1392 in *stile comune*)

It is known that Wenceslaus, albeit formally King of the Romans from 1376, was never officially crowned in Rome as Holy Roman Emperor. The lectures were intended to confer prestige on the *Studio*, on its *Signore* Pietro Gambacorta, and on the city of Pisa in general. The lectures mark a vital moment both in the Pisan cult of Dante and in the history of the critical reception of the poem, particularly as regards Pisa's longstanding rivalry with Florence, where no new lectures on Dante had been scheduled after Boccaccio's unfinished public reading (October 1373–January 1374). The publication, sponsored by the Gambacorta family, was intended to be an event of some note, as is attested by the high quality of MS B, partly transcribed and edited by the family's chaplain "Iohannes quondam Wilhelmi de Berlandia" (f. 92va) and exquisitely illuminated.

The first version of the commentary was completed in 1394 (1395 according to the Pisan calendar) as is confirmed by the colophon of MS Oxford, Taylor Institution, 8 It. 3, f. 251v:

lectura facta per me Francesco di Bartolo da Biuti [palaeographical error for 'Buiti'] et chompiuta el dì della festa di Santo Barnaba, cioè a dì 11 di giungno nel 1395 Indictione sechunda.

Nevertheless, in November 1394 Buti returned to work on the text and started the revision of the glosses on *Inferno* and *Paradiso* by introducing modifications, corrections and integrations, and by adding more citations from ancient authorities. The new version of the commentary was concluded on 22 December 1396 (1397 according to the Pisan calendar), as it is attested in the *explicit* of M (Franceschini 1998a, 219, and 1998b, 219–21 and n 31):⁷

⁶ Thanks to a document discovered by Pietro Silva (ASP, *Comune*, divisione A, reg. 221, f. 76), it is possible to establish that in 1385 Buti's annual salary increased significantly from 55 lire in 1355 to 308. Scholars claim that this wage rise was linked to his starting public lectures on Dante. See Silva 1918, 492; Franceschini 2011a, 195.

⁷ Note that the scribe omits an "x" in the date (1397 and not 1387) twice and confuses the name of the saint, namely Barnaba, with Bartholomeo. See also Franceschini 1995, 62.

Et qui finisce lo canto XXXIII della terza canticha della *Commedia* di Dante Alleghieri, o vero Aldighieri, e la sua lectura edita et compiuta per me Francesco di Bartolo da Buyti cittadino di Pisa lo dì della festa di sancto Bartholomeo addi xj di giugno nel MCCCLXXXV, et poi ricorsa per me qui nel xxij di dicembre MCCCLXXXVII Indictione v.

A key question, which is examined in this study, is whether or not the revisionary process also involved the text of the *Purgatorio*. The glosses on *Purgatorio* are preserved by the smallest number of MSS (nine),⁸ which points to the different success that the commentaries on the three *cantiche* enjoyed. As is generally accepted, the number of surviving copies of a text is a valid indicator of its success and circulation. The case of the Bible is undoubtedly the best example, as the extraordinarily high number of its surviving copies attests. According to Greetham (1992 (1994), 304), more than eight thousand copies exist just of the New Testament.⁹ Although nowhere near as successful as the Bible, Dante's *Comedy* offers another valid example of this phenomenon, since it has survived in over eight hundred manuscripts and fragments, a unique figure for a work in the vernacular (e.g. Ciociola 2001, 176). It was thus important to establish whether or not Francesco revised the glosses on *Purgatorio*, since this would cast light on the way in which a less successful reception might have influenced his *modus operandi*. It can be established that Buti did not review the text of his commentary on the *Purgatorio*. Therefore, it appears that a revised authorial version did not circulate, as is the case for *Inferno*'s and *Paradiso*'s reworked glosses. It can be argued that, after the success achieved by the publication of the *Inferno*, facilitated by the Florentine edition now preserved in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, namely Palatino Latino 1728 = P, and its several *descripti*, the circulation of the *Purgatorio* was affected by the interruption of the oral exposition, on account of the "due gravi infermitadi" which the author mentions in the *Proemio*. Another reason which might have contributed to a less favourable reception was the political crisis that affected the Pisan *Comune*, which had repercussions for Buti himself, following the *coup d'état* led by Iacopo D'Appiano in 1392 against the Gambacorta family, which led to a change of regime. Once the political situation had stabilised, a major relaunch of Buti's public role and of his commentary occurred in 1394, with the completion of the *Paradiso* during his public office as *Cancelliere*. At this point, the circulation of the entire commentary began, perhaps together with the autonomous circulation of the second version of *Paradiso*, reviewed between 1394 and 1396, while the *Purgatorio* did not circulate independently. Although the *commento* on *Purgatorio* does not

⁸ The *Inferno* and *Paradiso* manuscripts traditions are respectively composed of fourteen and eleven manuscripts.

⁹ See also Würthwein 1979, 12–15, and Aland and Aland 1989, 48–71 for the history of the transmission of the Old Testament and New Testament texts respectively.

show any process of revision, it is nonetheless important to provide a new and reliable edition of this *cantica*, one that is in line with the editions of *Inferno* and of *Paradiso*.

Given its importance, it is not surprising that Buti's commentary has been studied in some depth, especially during the last thirty or so years. The research of scholars such as Novati 1897, Nomi Pesciolini 1905, Mazzoni 1971, Alessio 1981, Banti 1995, Varanini 1995, Tolaini 2002, Costamagna 2003, Basile 2005, and others, together with the many studies completed by Franceschini, have contributed to a better understanding of Buti's biography and his historical context, of the commentary's genesis and of its structure, its linguistic concerns and its ideological dimension.

The *commento*'s text is preserved in twenty-eight manuscripts,¹⁰ all of which have been dated between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Among these, only three contain the commentary as a whole, whereas the rest transmit the *chiosa* on one *cantica* only, or, as with MS L, the *chiose* on two (*Purgatorio* + *Paradiso*). This is mainly due to the considerable length of the text, which has led some scholars to believe that more than one copyist was commissioned to execute the same editorial project.¹¹ Furthermore, as already noted, the three *cantiche* encountered different degrees of success, as is confirmed by the smaller number of copies of the *Purgatorio* commentary, of which there are only six, without considering the three copies that include the entire *commento*. On the other hand, the *Inferno* commentary is transmitted in eleven manuscripts, while that of the *Paradiso* by nine. The copies found in B, M and N were all produced in the western part of Tuscany and edited by copyists who were familiar with the language in use in the area, which faithfully reflects the author's. These three copies not only transmit the commentary as a whole, but they are also the oldest; and yet they all transmit the second and final draft of the *Paradiso*. In particular, the copy contained in B can be defined as *idiografia*, since it was partly written under the author's supervision. It was produced in Pisa and edited, as previously noted, by Iohannes de Berlandia, who was the chaplain of the Gambacorta family, hence working within the same entourage as Buti. Iohannes transcribed Buti's *Inferno* while the commentator was drafting the *Purgatorio* glosses

¹⁰ The Wellesley and Piacenza fragments are considered as part of the same original manuscript (Franceschini 2011a, 203).

¹¹ For instance, MSS *Riccardiani* 1006, 1007 (R2) and 1008 were edited as part of the same editorial project, as well as MSS Milan, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense AF XI 31 and 32 (MB'), together with Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conv. Soppr. J III 4 (*Paradiso*). MSS Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plutei 42.14 (*Inferno*), 42.15 (L2), 42.16 (*Paradiso*), written by Bartolomeo Nerucci da San Gimignano for his *lectura Dantis* in Prato, also belong to the same editorial project (Bellomo 2004, 250; Franceschini 2011a, 203). On Nerucci as reader of Dante, see Franceschini 2011b and 2013, 73–75.

(Franceschini 1995, 51 n 16; Tardelli 2010, 24 and n 16). In 1392, following the *coup d'état* led by Iacopo D'Appiano which deposed the government of the Gambacorta family, the manuscript, drafted in Pisan vernacular by Iohannes as far as *Purgatorio* 9.34, was transferred to Florence, where the editing was completed by a different unnamed copyist in Florentine (Franceschini 1995, 50–52). It was finally acquired by the monks of the Badia fiorentina in 1496. Although the *Inferno* commentary transmitted in B appears to be a first draft, it conveys the second and final version of the *Paradiso* glosses, and it is the only manuscript to include a much shorter version of the *Purgatorio*, a sort of *compendium*, from *Purgatorio* 11 onwards. At *Paradiso* 27. 139–48, in a passage which is not present in Giannini, MS B transmits the date 1405 (*f.* 265ra), whereas MS N, as well as the rest of the manuscript tradition, conveys the original date 1396 (1397 *stile pisano*):

Et questo è quello che l'autore vuole dimostrare, cioè che inanti che questo sia, adverrà quello che dirà hora; et se altri volesse opponere che dovrebbe già essere passato lo verno più là più di due mesi, desi rispondere che Cesari corresse questo errore quando fece lo suo computo, ma poi sono mancati pressoché xv di imperò che sono passati pressoché xv centinaia d'anni, imperò che sono anni **MCCCLXXXVII** dalla incarnatione di Cristo, che fu socto Octaviano, et Cesari fu inanti a llui, sì che lo verno dovrebbe incominciare, ad questa ragione, in kalende di gennaio al presente; et inanti che genaio esca del verno, converrà che passino anni III milia.

This hitherto unknown passage proves that in 1396 Buti had nearly finished the second draft of his *commento*, concluded on 22 December of the same year.

MS M was written in Lucca by the *scriba* “Iohannes di Nicolao” at the beginning of the fifteenth century. In 1405 Paolo Guinigi, *Signore* of Lucca, purchased “trium librorum in quibus descripte sunt expositiones Dantis manu magistri Francisci de Buyti” (Archivio di Stato di Lucca, *Camarlingo generale*, n. 84, *f.* 132v). Franceschini (1995, 57–59) has argued that these books are the originals from which the copy of M was made, since in 1431, a “liber Commentum super Dante, domini Francisci de Buti, in membranis, cum cubertis ligneis, corio albo foderatis” is mentioned in the catalogue of Guinigi's library. In light of this description, the book in question does not seem to match the three volumes acquired by Paolo Guinigi in 1405, whereas it would offer a perfect description of M (Franceschini 1995, 52–62).

MS N, edited during the first two decades of the fifteenth century, used to belong to the famous Neapolitan medical doctor and bibliophile Domenico Cotugno, as one can read in the ownership note in the rear flyleaf. After his death in 1822, his valuable book collection was sold and the manuscript was purchased by the Biblioteca Nazionale “Vittorio Emanuele III” of Naples in 1828. Unfortunately, there is no information regarding when or under what circumstances the volume arrived in the Naples area. Nevertheless, it is possible to establish that it was edited by a Pisan

copyist and exquisitely illuminated by the second decade of the fifteenth century, especially as regards the splendid miniature representing the mystical procession of *Purgatorio* 29, which occupies two consecutive full-pages (ff. 119v–120r). In relation to the illustrations, Degenhart and Schmitt (1968, 174–75) suggested that two different persons had contributed to illuminating the manuscript: one from the Naples area, and the other showing the influence of the *scriptorium* of the Scuola fiorentina degli Angeli. On the other hand, Rotili (1972, 94–95) has argued that the two artists were from Umbria and the Siena area respectively, although the latter was active in Umbria, where Rotili believed the manuscript was fashioned. Rotili was possibly influenced by Petrocchi's erroneous statement that the text contained in the manuscript was “umbro-marchigiano” (1965, 212): “caratteri umbro-toscani si debbono poi assegnare a vari testimoni, quale il XIII.C.I. della Nazionale di Napoli, e linguisticamente umbro-marchigiano è uno dei più antichi manoscritti del poema”. Furthermore, Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto (1999), in agreement with Rotili as regards the Umbrian influence, has gone so far as to suggest that the miniatures ought to be attributed to Lorenzo and Jacopo Salimbeni. On the other hand, Luciano Bellosi (1985) has suggested that the author of the full-pages miniatures of *Purgatorio* 29 (ff. 119v–120r) is the anonymous Maestro of the Bracciolini Chapel from Pistoia. Following Bellosi, De Benedictis (2011) has noted that the anonymous Maestro is also the author of the three historiated initials of *Inferno* 7, 8, and *Paradiso* 6. The rest of the illustrations are to be attributed to an unknown “miniature pisano” (2011, 173). De Benedictis has also argued that “dal momento che sia il Commento di Francesco da Buti sia il copista sono pisani, è verosimile supporre che il manoscritto sia stato confezionato a Pisa” (2011, 173). Moreover, De Benedictis hypothesizes that the miniaturizing of MS N is to be related to the public lectures “in grammaticalibus, logicalibus et in arte oratoria” given by Antonio di ser Salvo da San Gimignano in Pistoia during the first two decades of the fifteenth century (Casamassima and Savino 1995, 189 n. 5), and perhaps also to the return in Pistoia of the humanist Sozomeno da Pistoia (1387–1458) from Padua in 1413 (De Benedictis 2011, 175). These recent studies suggest the likelihood that the copy was written in the Pisa-Lucca area and that it was illuminated in nearby Pistoia, finally disproving the unpersuasive thesis that the manuscript was transcribed in Umbria and illuminated in the Naples area. Thus, the manuscript must have been taken to Naples only after it had been finalised in the Pisa-Pistoia area. More importantly, it can now be definitively concluded that the manuscript had no association with the Umbria area. The Pisan origin of the *scriba*, suggested by De Benedictis,¹² seems to be suggested not only by the language of the text but also

¹² De Benedictis, however, does not explain how she has come to the conclusion that the copyist is Pisan. See also Franceschini 2016, p. 270, n 35.

by some external notes which I have found in the margins and which are addressed to the reader (Tardelli 2014, 97). For instance, at *Inferno* 18.10 one can read:

volge questa ca[rta] per lo texto del p[ri]ncipio di questa chios[a].

A very similar sort of instruction is also found at *Inferno* 16.91 and at *Purgatorio* 4 ('volge' etc.) These notes are directly addressed to the reader, who would find the corresponding glosses to Dante's text on the following page. The imperative form in *-e* rather than in *-i* contributes to reinforces the hypothesis that not only is the text Pisan but that the copyist was also from West Tuscany.¹³ This evidence establishes on firm ground the proximity of this hugely important copy of the *commento* to Buti's geographical area — especially as it includes the second draft of the commentary, and therefore the author's final version of his work — and contributes further to defining it as the *bon manuscript* of Buti's *commento*, as was first proposed by Tardelli (2010, 19–32). The *Inferno* text preserved in N presents several integrations and modifications which are similar to the ones already highlighted and studied by Franceschini with regard to the *Paradiso* glosses (Franceschini 1998a and 1998b; Tardelli 2014, 97; 120–25), showing that a revisionary process also concerned the *Inferno* text, albeit on a much smaller case than that of the *Paradiso*. On the other hand, as previously discussed, it is now possible to establish that no revisionary process was involved as regards the *Purgatorio* commentary.

In relation to its fortune, between the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries the commentary was well received in the whole of Tuscany. Many famous figures owned a copy of the *commento*, such as members of the Guinigi family of Lucca; Cione da Ravi of Maremma; intellectuals and members of the Florentine Academy, such as Vincenzo Borghini and Piero del Nero; Crusca Academy members, such as Pietro Segni "l'Agghiacciato" and Gianbattista Deti "il Sollo", Antonio de' Medici and members of the de' Bardi family; Dante scholars such as Filippo Villani, *lector* in Florence, Bartolomeo Nerucci da San Gimignano, lecturer in Prato (Franceschini 1995, 100; 2013, 73–75). Moreover, the interest in Buti's *commento* within religious circles is confirmed by fra Bartolomeo da Colle, one of the most famous preacher of the fourteenth-century, who decided to include Buti's gloss in his own copies of the *Commedia* (Franceschini 2013, 83–88). Interestingly, the MSS tradition is composed of several copies whose features point to their having belonged to notarial and mercantile circles rather than professional ones (Pomaro

¹³ See Castellani 2000, 331: "Imperativo: a Pisa la desinenza della 4^a classe, come quella della 2^a e 3^a classe, è esclusivamente *-e*". On the nature of the notes, see Tardelli 2014, 97.

2003, 317–19). This shows that curiosity in Buti's commentary was broad and not just limited to intellectual, political, and religious circles.

Nevertheless, Buti's glosses only met with very limited success outside Tuscany, as is confirmed by the vernaculars used in the MSS, which are all from the Tuscan area.¹⁴ Florence was the most receptive to Francesco's work. The commentary met with very early success within the erudite circle of Santa Croce, on account to the interest of fra Tedaldo della Casa. For instance, in 1394, one of the first copies of the *Inferno* commentary was completed in a manuscript edited in Florence by a particularly intelligent and active *scriba* (P). This version is the hyparchetype of many other MSS produced in the Florence area, including the Riccardiano 1006 (*Inferno*), the text chosen by Giannini for his nineteenth-century edition.¹⁵ The commentary's popularity in the Florence area is also confirmed by the influence of Francesco's commentary on Filippo Villani's work (Bellomo 2004, 387). On the other hand, the texts preserved in MSS Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plutei 42.14, 42.15 (L2) and 42.16, and edited by Bartolomeo Nerucci da San Gimignano between 1431 and 1434, confirm the success it enjoyed among students of grammar during the first half of the fifteenth century.¹⁶ Among humanists, Francesco's *chiose* were extensively utilised by Cristoforo Landino while writing his *Comento*, first published in Florence in 1481 by Niccolò di Lorenzo della Magna, as is confirmed by Barbi's research (1890 (1975), 146–79) and, more recently, by Procaccioli (1989, 143–254), and by Gilson (2005, 194–98; 213–28). During the fifteenth-century, Francesco is one of the best-known and most highly regarded Dante commentators, especially in the Florence area. Despite these successes, Buti's commentary was increasingly supplanted by Landino's *Comento*, and although copied during the following centuries within erudite circles (Franceschini 2011a, 204), it was first published as a whole only between 1858–62¹⁷ in Pisa by the Nistri brothers and edited by Crescentino Giannini.

This edition is based on MSS Riccardiani 1006, 1007 (R2) and 1008, since the editor believed them to be “i codici più reputati esistenti nelle pubbliche Biblioteche di Firenze” (Giannini, ed.

¹⁴ MS Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rossiano 1069 (= VR), (*Inferno*), is the only text demonstrating linguistic traits from the North of Italy.

¹⁵ MS Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Panciatichiano 5 (40; III 7) (= PA); MS Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Pluteo 42.13 (= L0); MS Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Pluteo 90 sup. 122 (= L5).

¹⁶ Nerucci edited MSS L1 (*Inferno*); L2 (dated 1431, *Purgatorio* and some *excerpta* from the Anonimo latino and the Falso Boccaccio); L3 (dated 1434, *Paradiso* and some chapters of the *Ottimo*).

¹⁷ In 1565 *La Novella di Romeo con somma diligentia nuovamente stampata* was printed in Venice by Gabriele Giolito de Ferrari. It is the story of Romeo di Villanova and Raimondo Beringhieri excerpted from Buti's commentary (*Paradiso* 6.127–42). The *Annotazioni alla 'Divina Commedia'* ed. by Renzi (1817–18) also contains some of Buti's *chiose* based on MSS R1, R2, and R3.

1858–62, 1: viii), with checks being made against MS M, although its readings were not fully noted. These MSS were chosen since they been cited “dall’Accademia della Crusca, e quello (*scil.* 1006) più di codesto (*scil.* M)” (Giannini 1858–62, 1: viii). This fact highlights one of the main problems regarding Giannini’s edition, namely its language. In particular, Giannini’s text of the *Inferno* presents the phono-morphological and lexical characteristics of the Florentine vernacular rather than of Pisan, and thus departs from the author’s original language. Furthermore, the text of Giannini’s edition does not adhere as closely as possible to the original form, essential prerequisite for any philologically rigorous edition (Reynolds and Wilson, eds. 1968 (1974), 212). MS 1006 is a *descriptus* of MS P, a manipulated text produced in the Florence area (Tardelli 2014, 108–13), whereas MS 1008 transmits the first draft of the *Paradiso* commentary, concluded in 1394. The *Purgatorio* text (R2) is the only one edited in Pisan vernacular by “Theodricus de Andrea Teutonicus”, a German *scriba* keen on keeping the linguistic features of his model. Giannini was also aware of MS B, although the text’s readings were neither utilised nor noted in his edition, as well as the four (not five as he states in the *Preface*) “laurenziani” preserving the *Inferno* commentary (Giannini, ed. 1858–62, 1: 544 and n 1). The edition is dedicated to Giorgio Giovanni Warren Lord Vernon, and includes an Introduction by Silvestro Centofanti and a brief unacknowledged biography of Buti. The same edition was reprinted in facsimile in 1989, with a preface written by Francesco Mazzoni.

The extant manuscript tradition of Buti’s commentary is not the richest among Dante commentaries.¹⁸ However, it is highly probable that the number of copies in circulation was much greater, since it was transcribed in Florence as early as 1394 (P) and continued to be copied up to the end of the fifteenth-century. Furthermore, it is important to note that Buti’s *commento* is one of, if not actually, the lengthiest (over one million-word long). This latter fact can constitute a problem for any philologist endeavouring to prepare a critical edition. A complete and conventional collation of all the manuscripts would have been unrealistic. It is also important to note that especially prose commentaries were written without strict formal constraints, which allowed modification, rewriting, re-arrangement, and the addition of new material. This phenomenon reflects the concept of “mouvance” of medieval texts described by Zumthor in relation to medieval French poetry. According to Zumthor (1972), medieval vernacular works were not normally regarded as the intellectual property of a single, named author, and could be indefinitely reworked by others, passing through a series of different “états du texte” (1972, 72). The modern emphasis on textual

¹⁸ The manuscript tradition of Iacomo della Lana’s *Comento*, for instance, is made up of over one hundred copies (Volpi 2008, 269–72).

authenticity (i.e. the attempt to reconstruct the author's original as the only authentic version of the text) is therefore considered anachronistic as an editorial approach, ignoring as it does the “mobilité essentielle du texte médiéval” (1972, 71). Not surprisingly, and in keeping with the previous results obtained for the *Inferno* (Tardelli 2014), it has not been possible to group the manuscripts in Lachmannian terms — that is to say, it has not been possible to reconstruct the author's original and to equip the text with a conventional and fixed critical apparatus which registers all the MSS variants —,¹⁹ on account of cross-contamination of lines of descent, in keeping with what Greetham effectively describes (1992 (1994), 324): “it remains true that the Lachmannian system *can* not effectively deal, for example, with any sort of horizontal ‘cross-fertilization’ of lines of descent (as opposed to the expected vertical dissemination of the standard Lachmannian stemma), whether by conflation (a copyist's working from two exemplars at the same time) or by contamination (a copyist's incorporation of remembered readings from one version while actually copying from another exemplar)”. This general phenomenon defined by Greetham accurately describes the accidents of transmission that occurred with Buti's text. Additionally, any conventional attempt at arriving at a *restitutio textus* is further complicated by the likely presence of a “originale in movimento”, which makes a Lachmannian approach to Buti's text anachronistic and, to some extent, counter-productive.²⁰ Nevertheless, the extant MSS tradition of Buti's *Purgatorio* have been thoroughly explored, and the results of the investigation are presented in this study. Since no systematic philological study has ever been undertaken of the *Purgatorio* text, a traditional word-by-word collation was carried out for the *Proemio* and the first two *canti*, thereby allowing me comprehensively to assess the dynamics of at least two complete cantos. *Loci selecti* have subsequently been identified and compared in the extant manuscript tradition from *Purgatorio* 3 onwards.²¹

Following this investigation, I was able to identify two groups of MSS: the first, which I term α , is composed of N, L2, MB' and R4; the second, which I designate as β , is composed of B, M,

¹⁹ On Lachmann's method, see Timpanaro 1963 (2004); on the objections levelled at stemmatic method see Reeve 2011, 27–44.

²⁰ On the “tradizione orizzontale” as opposed to the vertical line of descent, see Pasquali 1952 (1988), 140–41; on Lachmann's limitations see also Reynolds and Wilson 1968 (1974), 225–27.

²¹ The same criteria have been applied to the new edition of the *Inferno* (Tardelli 2010–11). See Tardelli 2014, 127–29. *Loci selecti* are as follows: 3.Intro; 3.1–9; 3.10–21; 3.22–33; 3.34–45; 3.46–60; 3.61–72; 3.79–93; 3.103–17; 3.118–32; 3.133–41; 4.1–18; 4.31–39; 4.58–76; 4.76–87; 20.85–96; 21.103–11; 21.103–11; 22.64–93; 25.31–60; 28.103–20; 29.82–96.

C,²² L, and R2. Nevertheless, it is very important to note that the grouping outlined above does not consistently occur on account of conflation and contamination, as already noted. Consequently, the data reported in the tables below are not representative of a systematic pattern in the relationship of the manuscript tradition, but only reflect a tendency. Nonetheless, in the table of errors below I demonstrate that it is possible to postulate the α group (N, L2, MB', R4) by considering the following common errors:²³

	α group	β group
1.7–12	<i>om.</i>	imperò che quine monsterrà ogni sua potentia nel modo del dire et nella materia
1.22–27	Et questo si manifesta imperò che come l'autore finge ne la prima cantica che sempre andasse col sole dric to inverso sinistra, così finge in questa che sempre andasse col sole inansi inverso man dextra.	Et questo si manifesta imperò che come l'autore finge ne la prima cantica che sempre andasse col sole diri eto inverso mano sinistra, così finge in questa che sempre andasse col sole inansi inverso man dextra.
2.25–36	<i>om.</i> ²⁴	<i>che le ginocchia cali</i> , cioè che tt'inginocchi. <i>Ecco l'angel di Dio</i> , ecco che llie manifesta, <i>piega le mani</i> [...]
3. Intro.	prima pone come pervenne ad Roma ²⁵ al monte	prima pone come pervenne al monte
3. Intro.	Nella terça finge come Virgilio riprenda (R4, L2: <i>risponda</i>) tucti li homini o vero ad meglio dire riprese la sua paura et dichiarollo d'alcuno dubbio, quine: E 'l mio conforto et cetera. Nella quarta finge che Virgilio riprenda tucti li homini che sono troppo presuntuosi	Nella terça finge come Virgilio riprese la sua paura et dichiarollo d'alcuno dubbio, quine: E 'l mio conforto et cetera. Nella quarta finge che Virgilio riprenda tucti li homini che sono troppo presuntuosi

²² MS C, in relation to *canti* 1–4, presents numerous *variae lectiones* in the margins. A detailed study as well as a separate edition of these unpublished *lectiones*, which I believe are not authorial, is in progress.

²³ Only some of the most significant common errors are noted in the table.

²⁴ Both R4 and MB' transmit: “eccho l'angel di Dio”.

²⁵ Expunged in L2.

3.10–21	secondo la lictera, finge Dante che corresse Virgilio, et elli diriecto a llui come l’altre anime correano ²⁶	secondo la lictera, finge Dante che corresse Virgilio, et elli diriecto a llui come l’altre anime corseno
3.22–33	et era allora levato lo sole sì che in questo hemisperio era tramonto, sì che ben v’è (R4, L2: è) ²⁷ sera allora	et era a llozo levato lo sole sì che in questo hemisperio era tramonto, sì che ben c’era sera allora
3.34–45	dimostra qui che appena delli scientiati	dimostra qui che la pena delli scientiati
3.46–60	<i>sì venian lente</i> , che cioè la dureça del sallire della penitentia <†> similmente significa che venisseno da man sinistra, imperò che nel purgatorio non si va se non da man diricta, et però volendo mostrare che venisse verso loro che stavano ad aspectare et vedere, convenia che venisse la gente di verso man sinistra di Dante. Et però dice ²⁸	<i>sì venian lente</i> , cioè sì venivano lentamente che non pareva che si movesseno
3.61–72	<i>chi ne darà consillio</i> , cioè al nostro camino, quando si strinseno udivi massi dell’alta ripa et stecter fermi et strecti, cioè ad guardare chi va dubitando e stassi, ²⁹ <i>se tu da te medesmo aver non lo puoi</i>	<i>chi ne darà consillio</i> , cioè al nostro camino, <i>se tu da te medesmo aver non lo puoi</i>
3.79–93	allora le dicte anime vedendo questo, <i>et trasser sé indietro alquanto ... fenno altretanto</i> , cioè di restarsi et trarsi adrieto che venivano inançi	allora le dicte anime che veniano inansi vedendo questo, <i>et trasser sé indietro alquanto... fenno altretanto</i> , cioè di restarsi et trarsi adrieto.

²⁶ The relevant *folio* is missing in R4.

²⁷ MB’ amends in “v’era”.

²⁸ The same passage precedes in the *chiosa* in all the MSS. In other words, in the ancestor, where the error originated, the same passage had been copied twice.

²⁹ A similar case of “jump ahead” as in the previous example, expunged in L2. The same passage follows shortly after in all the MSS.

3.118–32	nel pecto sommo del pecto ³⁰	al sommo del pecto
3.133–41	Ad che debbiamo sapere che chi è scomunicato dal papa, o da’ suoi vicari, è fuori della congregatione de’ fedeli cristiani, sì che nulla oratione che si faccia per la Sancta Chiesa di magior scomunicatione et per li catolici. ³¹	Ad che debbiamo sapere che chi è scomunicato dal papa, o da’ suoi vicari, di magior scomunicatione è fuori della congregatione de’ fedeli cristiani, sì che nulla oratione che si faccia per la Sancta Chiesa et per li catolici.
3.133–41	et dopo lo terço dì, avuto santo Gregorio che questi era per questo peccato gravemente tormentato per revelatione, comandò al proposto che tre ³² giorni facesse dire messe nel monesterio et celebrare lo divino sacramento per l’anima di questo monaco. Facto questo, et infine de’ tre ³³ dì adparve il dicto monaco	et dopo 30 dì, avuto santo Gregorio che questi era per questo peccato gravemente tormentato per revelatione, comandò al proposto del monastero che 30 giorni facesse dire messe nel monesterio et celebrare lo divino sacramento per l’anima di questo monaco. Facto questo, et infine de’ 30 dì adparve il dicto monaco
4.1–18	<i>om.</i>	la quale pillia et unisce ad sé la vegetativa et sensitiva, dando loro perfetione, la quale non arebbero da sé. Et fa questa unione per sì facto modo ch’ella è cagione del loro operare et mai non si disfà questa unione, ma anco quando si parte l’anima dal corpo, ne la porta seco benché non abbino più attività niuna, et viene l’anima humana dotata de le infrascripte tre dote, le quali sono più active quando è separata dal corpo che quando è coniunta. Viene addunqua

This last case is representative of the phenomenon previously defined as conflation. The part of the text that the α group omits here is in reality also transmitted in N, but in the lower margin, which shows that the copyist was working from two exemplars at the same time.

One final point that needs to be made here is that L2, MB’ and R4 are not direct copies of N, since N includes unique errors. It is thus more plausible that these four manuscripts derive from a

³⁰ Both L2 and MB’ try to mend to error: L2 expunged the first “pecto”, MB’ only transmits “nel pecto”.

³¹ L2 adds “di magior scomunicatione” in the upper margin but it also transmits it after “Sancta Chiesa”.

³² L2 amends “tre” in “trenta”.

³³ L2 amends “tre” in “trenta”.

common (and lost) intermediate source. The α group is also characterised by many homeoteleuta and palaeographical errors, generally considered as polygenetic errors, that is errors that several copyists could have made independently of one another, and therefore not useful to classify manuscripts genealogically (Stussi 1994 (2001), 100–04; Trovato 2014, 55). However, the persuasive possibility of considering certain omissions as monogenetic rather than polygenetic errors is explored by Zaccarello (2012, 109–35).³⁴ Zaccarello suggests that in some cases these errors ought to be considered ancillary evidence of relationship between MSS, especially when such errors can be systematically documented in all the MSS that are grouped together. The data gathered so far would suggest that N, L2, R4 and MB' all originate from a common ancestor. However, some other findings would indicate that L2, R4 and MB' actually derive from a collateral of N, at least as far as the later part of the copying process was concerned, namely from *Purgatorio* 20 onwards. In fact, another problem that arises when dealing with long prose texts is the possibility that scribes used an exemplar up to a certain point (i.e. until it was available), and then worked from a different one. As a result, the new product would be a sort of “hybrid text” whose relationship to its models is difficult, if not impossible, to establish. The following examples usefully illustrate this kind of circumstance:

	N (= β)	L2= R4, MB'
20.85–96	Et intorno ad ciò è da sapere che, essendo papa Bonifatio VIII natio d'Alagna, <nel> 1301 nel papato	Et per informatione di questo dobbiamo sapere che essendo papa Bonifatio nel papato
	Et in Alagna et in Roma rubbonno li predicti la camera del papa, per la qual cosa poi lo dicto papa visse poi 4 dì dipo la presura sua in Alagna, et da sua antica infermità di fianco, stricto più fortemente che l'altre volte, forse per la malagevilessa che sostenne in quelli tre dì et tre nocti che fu ditenuo ch'era di verno, finite la vita sua in Roma ne la camera sua	Et fu rubata la camera del papa dalla gente dell'arme et in Alagna et in Roma. Et dicesi che in quelli tre dì non prese altro cibo che uova fresche scaldate in su uno tésto di bruna ch'elli portava alla sedia. Et chi dice che stette quelli tre dì et tre nocti assediato dalla dicta gente pure nella camera sua et fu liberato perché l'altra parte che non era nel tractato di quelli d'Alagna si levò dipo li tre dì et cacciò fuori l'altra parte e lli Franceschi et quelli della Colonna. Et liberato se ne venne papa Bonifatio ad Roma. Et stato 4 (R4 MB': <i>quaranta</i>) dì dipo lo dicto stringimento si morì

³⁴ See also Reeve 2011, 55–103.

		<p>strecto dalla passione del fianco che aveva, ma forse per lo disagio che aveva sostenuto quando fu sostenuto (<i>assediato et sostenuto</i> MB') o per malinconia più stretto che l'altre volte ne morì</p>
21.103–11	<p><i>son tanto seguaci</i>, cioè delle passioni unde descendeno</p>	<p><i>son tanto seguaci</i>, sono tanto seguitatori delle passioni onde si muovono et cagionano</p>
21.103–11	<p>cioè da la quale, <i>ciascun si spicca</i>, cioè di quelli acti di sopra nominati, <i>si spicca</i>, cioè procede</p>	<p><i>ciascun si spicca</i>, cioè alla passion dentro dell'animo da la quale ciascuno di quelli acti procede</p>
22.64–93	<p>cioè del purgatorio nel quale si purga l'accidia, <i>cercar mi fé</i>, cioè me Statio, «o vero, cerchiar, cioè girare intorno», <i>più che 'l quarto centesimo</i>, centesimo s'intende tempo di cento anni, sì che più che il quarto centesimo, cioè più che 400 anni, sì che più che 400 anni</p>	<p><i>cercar mi fé più che 'l quarto centesimo</i>, cioè fece me girare intorno lo quarto cerchio del purgatorio u' si purga il peccato dell'accidia più di 400 anni. Centesimo è tempo di cento anni. Et che secondo che finge l'autore Statio era stato nel quarto cerchio più che 400 anni</p>
25.31–60	<p>lo quale sangue femineo, meno perfecto che quello de l'homo, si divide in du' parti, et l'una si serba per nutrimento del feto et l'altra si converte nel feto. Et quella nutritiva è intorneata da la generativa [...]³⁵</p>	<p>alquanto schiuso et circondato del sangue femineo meno puro che l'altro che è misto co'llo sperma virile sia dentro per nutrimento del feto [...]</p>
28.103–20	<p><i>Non dé parer di là poi meraviglia</i>, finge Dante che Mathelda dica a llui: “Non dé parer nel mondo meraviglia poichè così è”, dice Mathelda a dDante, <i>udito questo</i>, ch'io abbo dicto ad te, <i>quando alcuna pianta</i>, cioè d'erba o d'arbore, <i>senza seme palese vi s'appiglia</i>, cioè nasce ne la terra, et non fi' posta né seminata, o vero <i>non parebbe di là poi meraviglia</i>, udito questo</p>	<p><i>Non dé parer di là poi meraviglia</i>, cioè non dé parere poichè così è, <i>e di là</i>, cioè nel nostro hemisperio, dice Mathelda, meraviglia, <i>udito questo</i>, cioè ch'io t'abbo detto, <i>quando alcuna pianta senza seme palese vi s'appiglia</i>, cioè quando alchuno arbore o alchuna herba s'appiglia nella nostra terra senza seme apparente bene che non sia posta. Et ancho può dire lo texto: <i>Non parebbe di là poi</i></p>

³⁵ B, M, and C do not carry this passage; R2 reads: “lo quale sangue femineo, meno perfecto che quello de l'homo, si divide in du' parti, et l'una si serba per nutrimento del feto et l'altra si converte nel feto. Et quella nutritiva è intorneata da la generativa compreso in prima come lacte, et poi convertendolo in sangue et poi fasciandolo”. In this case, N's reading is the same as L's.

meravillia, udito questo ch'io t'ò detto quando
alcuna et cetera

29.82–96	<p><i>Possa che i fior et l'altre fresche herbecte</i>, che secondo la lictera erano in sul prato del paradiso, <i>ad rimpecto di me</i>, cioè Dante cioè incontra me, <i>dall'altra sponda</i> imperò ch'erano di là dal fiume et io Dante era ancora di qua, <i>«libere fur da quelle genti electe»</i>, cioè poi che funno passati quelli xxiiii seniori et rimase lo prato scoperto incontra ad me Dante, cioè poi che io ebbi passato parte del prato de la Sancta Scriptura</p>	<p><i>Possia che ' fiori et l'altre fresche herbette</i> <i>ad rimpecto di me dall'altra sponda libere</i> <i>fuor da quelle genti electe</i>, cioè poi che passato fu lo prato in sul quale erano l'erbe e i fiori dalla sponda di là dal fiume che venia ritto me da quella processione che detta è prima da candelabri, poi dalla turba grande vestita di bianco, che figura la fede ch'era già in loro et poi da' xxiiii signiori coronati di gilli, le quali corone figurano la victoria che Cristo dovea ottenere contro il nemicho dell'umana natura, conbattendo per liberarla dalla sua servitù. Et questo s'intende secondo la lettera, cioè poi che 'l prato fu scoperto, passata la turba. Et allegoricamente intese poi che 'l prato della Santa Scriptura passato questa parte</p>
----------	---	--

Moreover, my findings indicate the necessity to postulate the α' subgroup, composed of N and R4, which appears be contaminated at times with L2, and at other times with MB', as the following mutual errors show:

	α' (N + R4)	L2, MB' (= β)
1.7–12	dell'amor/dall'amor	dalla morte
1.7–12	elli era lo dicto decimo	elli era dicto lo decimo
1.13–21	ch'io usci' dell'aura morta	ch'io fuor usci' dell'aura morta
1.85–99	l'una nel limbo e l'aura nella spiaggia	l'una nel limbo et l'autro (<i>scil.</i> Catone) nella spiaggia
1.85–89	come lo giunco in terra	come lo giunco è fondato ³⁶ in terra

³⁶ L2 innovates: “nasce”.

	$\alpha' + MB'$	L2 (= β)
3.103–17	con Karlo conte di Provença	con Karlo, fratello del re Lodovico di Francia duca d'Angiò et conte di Provença
3.103–17	lo sconfisse a campo ove fu ferito et morto lo re Manfredi	lo sconfisse a Ceparo l'ultimo dì di ferraio nel 1265, ove fu ferito et morto lo re Manfredi

As for the rest of the manuscripts, in the table below, I demonstrate that it is possible to postulate the β group (B, M, C, L, R2)³⁷ by considering the following common errors:

N		β group
1.28–39	<i>Li raggi delle quattro luci sancte</i> , cioè di quelle quattro stelle che significavano le quattro virtù cardinali ³⁸	significano le
2.52–66	<i>Dunqua venimmo inansi ad voi un poco,</i> presso alla levata del sole, <i>per altra via,</i> perché venimmo per lo 'nferno et dal centro del Lucifero in su per lo luogo obscuro et alto, et voi siete venuti per lo mare	venneno ³⁹

These errors, albeit borderline in palaeographical terms, are considered significant in hypothesizing the β group (Zaccarello 2012, 109–35). In one case, the error alters the verbal tense (imperfect/ present), and it also produces a *lacuna* of the numeral/word “quattro”; in the other, the error alters the verbal person (first/ third plural), making it difficult to believe that the two copyists had produced both errors independently of one another, that is to say, that the two errors are polygenetical. Alongside these mutual errors, it is important to note that the β family always shares the same adia phorous variants.

³⁷ However, as already noted, B is the only MS to carry an abbreviated version of the *commento* on *Purgatorio* from *canto* 11 onwards.

³⁸ MS MB' also transmits “significano le”.

³⁹ L omits the verb.

Furthermore, I was able to trace a few innovations in both L and R2,⁴⁰ all limited to *Purgatorio* 2–4:

	N	L, R2
2.Intro.	Et è da notare che l'autore finge che tucti possano andare infine al purgatorio sì che a niuno è vietato andare infine quine ⁴¹	quine, ma tucti si tornano al luogo suo, infine che ànno compiuto la sua penitencia della negligentia dell' aspectare, et chi avesse peccato in tucte le 6 specie, dicte di sopra, in ogni luogo de' dicti 6 luoghi sta tanto, che sia purgato quel grado di negligensia. Et questo si dé intendere secondo la fictione dell'autore, et allegoricamente si dé intendere di quelli del mondo, che tanto di tempo perdeno, quanto stanno negligenti ad tornare ad la penitensia, et li scomunicati per ogni uno, 30 imperò che perdono, mentre che stanno scomunicati, lo merito della santa chiesa che è valevole per virtù del sangue di Cristo venduto 30 denari, che no ne partecipano mentre che stanno scomunicati
2.1–9	<i>Uscìa di Gange</i> , questo Gange è uno fiume ch'è nel nostro oriente, grandissimo fiume, et dice sancto Ysidoro che la Teologia lo chiama Geon Physon, et dice ch'esce del paradiso delitiarum et entra in mare correndo verso l'oriente, et però lo chiamano li autori foce orientale ⁴²	foce orientale, come Ibero che è ne la Spagna, fiume che corre inverso lo nostro occidente, chiamano foce occidentale

⁴⁰ I have also noted a *saut du même au même* in common (*presa/prese*), also shared by the α group (3.103–17) “per questa Gostança venne lo regno di Sicilia allo imperadore Arrigo prima, imperò ch'elli, <presa la dicta Gostansa per donna cavata del monesterio di Palermo ove ella era facta monaca et consecrata, prese> lo regno e Tancredi”. The overall data suggest that the error has originated independently in the α group and in the L + R2 subgroup.

⁴¹ MS C transmits the same reading of N but with the integration in the left margin.

⁴² This particular variant could also be interpreted as a *saut du même au même*, which happens when the same word (in this case *foce*) occurs more than once on the page, and the scribe, after writing it for the first time, brings his eye back to the page at the second occurrence, and so fails to copy the text in between. In this case the variant would not be an innovation transmitted in both R2 and L, but an error propagated in the rest of the tradition.

2.10–24	<i>et di socto a poco a poco un altro,</i> biancho, <i>a llui n'uscìo</i> , et questo era la stola bianca co' lla quale si dipingono li angeli sì che non si pare niuna forma corporale	corporale, se non nel volto. Li angeli quanto ad la verità non àno alcuna forma corporale imperò che sono spirito, ma dipingonsi col volto umano, ad dimostrare che àno volontà libera, ma ora è confermata in gratia: et con l'ali, ad significare la loro leggeressa che subitamente possano essere dove vuolliano: et sono due bianche, ad significare la memoria et lo intellecto puro che àno all'amore di Dio et del Cristo, et la stola bianca, ad significare che in loro è tucta nectessa da ogni peccato
2.25–36	<i>Ecco l'angel di Dio</i> , ecco che l'lie manifesta, <i>piega le mani</i> , cioè chinale giù addoppiate a farli reverentia	reverentia duo sono li atti della riverentia che si rende ad Dio et ai santi, cioè lo inginocchiare et adiungere le mani, che significano rimentimento della affetione et dell'opere ad colui ad cui lo fano
2.106–17	<i>a l'amoroso canto</i> , cioè al canto che tractava d'amore	amore o vero che era sì piacente che ogni uno facea di sé innamorare
3.22–33	impaccia raggio visuale	impaccia il raggio del superiore cielo lo 'nferiore, sì che non passi giuso infino alla terra, sì come si vede che lli raggi delle stelle fixe et delle pianete passano giuso et fanno l'operatione loro. Et anco si può intendere del raggio visuale
4.31–39	opere	opere. Lo 'ntrare la penitentia à le sue malagevillesse, com'è stato dicto di sopra, ma lo cominciare ad montare n'à più imperò che dice santo Agustino: “Angusta via est, que ducit ad vitam, et tamen per eam, nisi dilatato corde, non curritur”
4.58–76	antartico	antartico. Dante si meravigliava che 'l sole entrava tra lui et la parte nostra septentrionale, et non imaginava che elli era nell'altro hemisperio di là da la torrida çona verso l'antartico, sì che la via del sole era tra lui et

lo nostro polo artico, et però finge che Virgilio
gliel dichiara, dicendo

4.76–87 ragione

ragione, sì che per questo dà ad intendere così
la ragione, che mi fa advedere di quello che io
mi maraviglava, è questa: che 'l sole tanto va
di là da l'Equatore verso septentrione, quanto
va di là da l'Equatore verso l'antartico. Poi
esce di questa materia, dicendo

Having shown the ‘critical’ relationships between the extant manuscript tradition of the *Purgatorio*, it is clear the *constitutio textus* cannot be arrived at in a mechanical way due to the presence of numerous contaminations and interpolations. In other words, it is not possible to group the MSS in a Lachmannian way nor to trace a reliable *stemma codicum*. As for the case of the *Inferno* (Tardelli 2014, 126–29), it is thus appropriate to base the edition on a single authoritative manuscript, according to a fundamental methodological principle suggested by Rossi (2001, 130–31) regarding editions of Dante’s oldest commentaries:

Un’edizione tradizionale è forse improponibile: invece di attendere decenni per costituire una vulgata, magari inaffidabile, si potrà pubblicare un manoscritto che occupi un posto di sicuro rilievo nella trasmissione, oppure, anzi meglio, proporre una edizione che rappresenti razionalmente lo stato della tradizione: testo-base e apparato costituiranno un sistema unitario, da sottoporre all’interpretazione del lettore. [...] La contemperanza di un buon manoscritto base, da non promuovere a totem — con conseguente tabù —, e di un uso non rigido dello stemma che si è riusciti a tracciare (quando è possibile disegnarlo) offrono, in via di massima, sufficienti garanzie per la costituzione di un testo che sia provvisto di un valore critico o, per lo meno, criticamente tollerabile.⁴³

These recommendations have already been adopted in editing Buti’s *Inferno*, thus the new edition of the *Purgatorio* is based on MS N, since N is written in Pisan vernacular, which is the original language, it transmits all three *cantiche*, and it preserves the second and final draft of both the *Inferno* and the *Paradiso* commentary. Errors and vagaries of transmission have been amended through the comparison with MSS B, M, C, L, R2, L2, R4 and MB’, whose significant variants are noted in the *apparatus*. The reader can thus rely on a text which, for the first time, is consistent and uniform in its language as well as in its “lezione”. Moreover, the new edition provides an *apparatus*

⁴³ The application of the same principles has been supported by Bellomo 2001, 26.

fontium filling a longstanding gap in our knowledge of Buti's intellectual background, his scholarly resources, and his *modus operandi*.⁴⁴ The commentator drew on classical, Medieval-Latin, and patristic authors, as well as on the contemporary exegetical tradition on Dante's *Commedia*. In order better to understand the ways in which Buti utilised his sources, it is important to identify as many of these as possible. In fact, one feature of the commentary that continues to require further investigation concerns the relationship between Buti's commentary and the preceding and contemporary exegetical tradition on Dante's *Commedia*, as well as his relationship to classical, Medieval-Latin and patristic sources. If Dante is still regarded as one of the greatest authors of the Western canon, it is in part because he had been perceived and treated as an *Auctoritas* by his very earliest exegetes. Thus, it is vital to assess how the cultural and political networks of late medieval Pisa contributed in fundamental ways to the creation of the myth of Dante as "the greatest poet that ever lived" (Rinaldi, ed. 2014, 1: *). Building on the *apparatus fontium* of my new edition, scholars will soon be able to assess this vital aspect of the commentary, thereby allowing them to evaluate Buti's work with particular regard to the historical and cultural context in which it was composed.

As previously mentioned, a new edition of the text of the *Inferno* based on MS N, together with an *apparatus fontium*, has already been prepared (Tardelli 2010–11). The editing of the glosses to *Purgatorio* and *Paradiso* has also been recently completed (Tardelli Terry 2015), and the *Prolegomena* to the *Paradiso* are now in progress. The complete edition will soon be published by Salerno as part of their series "Edizione Nazionale dei commenti danteschi" in multiple volumes.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ The only comprehensive critical study so far on Buti's sources is Sassetto 1993, whose methodological limitations have been effectively highlighted by Rossi 1993. On Buti's sources, see Tardelli 2013a, and Tardelli 2013b.

⁴⁵ I am grateful to the *Modern Humanities Research Association* for supporting the final revision of my PhD theses for publication.